

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-28 were pending. Claims 1-28 were rejected. Claims 6-12 and 15-17 were objected to. In this paper, Claims 1, 2, 20, 23, 26, and 28 are amended; no claims are added or cancelled. Claims 1-28 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

On June 5, 2007 at 2:00pm EDT, Applicants' Attorney Branch and Agent Kane met with Examiner Baum via telephone interview. Independent Claim 1 was discussed, clarifying the 112 rejection. Agreement was reached regarding the 112 rejection. Further, Applicants agreed to restate the response to the 102 rejection.

Claims 6-12 and 15-17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and upon the base claim 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection overcome. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication in the Office Action that Claims 6-12 and 15-17 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed is rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, at this time, no claims have been so rewritten.

Claims 1, 20, 23, 26, and 28 (and 2-19, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 27 by dependency) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. In particular, the omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the claim

phrase “if a ...” whereas there does not exist a subsequent alternative (i.e., “else...”) effectively renders the “if a ...” phrase incomplete. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 20, 23, 26, and 28 to include as “else” limitation, per the Examiner’s request. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is moot and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 13, 14, and 18-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Gupta et al. (US 6,389,532). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding amended Claim 1, Gupta does not teach or suggest employing at least one policy *associated with the originating domain* to handle the verified digitally signed message for the recipient if the *public component* stored with the DNS server *verifies* that the digitally signed message originated from *the domain* associated with the sender’s address. Instead, Gupta discloses “[i]f the signature is valid, the router or firewall forwards the packet. Packets having an invalid signature are discarded.” See Gupta, column 2, lines 21-22. Gupta further discloses “a router which filters packets in accordance with a predetermined router limit. This predetermined limit may be, for example, a rate at which the router may receive packets from a particular source or sender.” See Gupta, column 7, lines 28-35. Gupta’s method of handling valid/invalid packets from a particular sender address does not teach or suggest *further* employing a policy associated with the originating domain associated with the sender’s address. Clearly, since Gupta does not teach or suggest further employing a policy *associated with the originating domain* to handle the verified digitally signed message for the recipient, at least this aspect of amended Claim 1 is unanticipated and non-obvious.

Furthermore, the cited art did not anticipate the claimed invention, even prior to the previous amendment. For example, Claim 1 recites a method for message authentication, the method comprising, in part, employing a private component of “a key pair *associated with a*

domain” to digitally sign a message if the message originates from “a sender’s address *associated with the domain*”, and “employing at least one policy to handle the verified digitally signed message for the recipient” if the public component of the key pair “verifies that the digitally signed message originated from *the domain associated with the sender’s address*.” As described in the specification, the invention enables verification that a message identifying a certain sender address actually originated from a separately validated domain that authorized the use of that sender’s address for messaging. See Specification, pp. 4 and 6. It is noteworthy that a domain is an indirect representation of the actual IP address for a resource; and in response to a request, the domain is subsequently resolvable by a Domain Name System (DNS) into a particular IP address for that resource.

Unlike the claimed invention, however, Gupta does not disclose or suggest enabling authentication of the *domain* from which a message purportedly originates. Rather, Gupta, which is directed only to IP multicasting (single message sent to multiple destinations at once), describes the use of digital signatures to verify that a sender of a multicast message packet actually belongs to a particular multicast group. When discussing key generation, Gupta discloses that an “owner creates and distributes public and private keys” and that the “owner may install the public keys in the DNS server [and] distributes private (secret) keys to authorized senders.” See Gupta, column 6, lines 9-19. Gupta makes no mention of associating either the public or private key with an indirect representation of a resource such as a domain, but rather with a multicast group of particular messaging addresses. Furthermore, for Gupta’s senders and receivers to communicate multicast messages, they must affirmatively join a multicast group by accessing a multicast group address that has been previously set up by a multicast group owner. See Gupta, column 1, lines 21-25. Significantly, no such affirmative action is taught by the claimed invention.

As discussed above, Gupta thus fails to disclose each element of the invention as claimed in amended Claim 1. Moreover, Gupta fails to disclose each element of the invention as claimed in amended independent Claims 20, 23, 26, and 28, the elements of which are similar to, albeit different from, the elements of amended Claim 1. Therefore, the amended independent claims are now in condition for allowance. Furthermore, since Claims 2-19, 21-22, 24-25, and 27 depend

from amended independent Claims 1, 20, 23, 26, and 28 respectively, these dependent claims are allowable for at least substantially the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-28) is in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: June 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant